

**THE VILLAGE OF COLD SPRING
HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW BOARD
85 Main St. Cold Spring, NY 10516**

October 10, 2012

Members present: Chairman; Al Zgolinski Members: Carolyn Bachan, Peter Downey, Marie Early and Kathleen Foley

Chairman Zgolinski opened meeting at 8:04 P.M.

1. New Business:

A. Butterfield Realty LLC, (Butterfield Hospital Building site) P.O. Box 170 Garrison

Matt Moran represented the Applicant. Mr. Moran noted the Applicant filed an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow for the demolition of the former Butterfield Hospital building along with two sheds and the section connecting the Lahey Pavilion with the hospital; the Lahey Pavilion is not included in the demolition proposal. The proposed demolition would make way for a mixed use redevelopment plan for the site. Details of that redevelopment plan have not yet been submitted to the HDRB or the Planning Board.

The Board members reviewed the application. Citing public interest in the project, a public hearing was scheduled for Wednesday, November 7, 2012 at 8:00 P.M. The Chairman reminded the Applicant that the property owners whose parcels adjoin the site need to be sent notifications of the hearing via registered mail.

B. Gretchen Dykstra, 8 Garden St.

The application is for modifications to an ancillary structure in the rear of the Dykstra property. Because of the limited visibility from public rights of way, board members debated whether the application should be reviewed. In the end, it was decided that the review was appropriate in terms of code requirements for visibility.

The Applicant proposed to replace windows and doors on an existing accessory building, modify the entrance grade, and add sky lights. The Applicant noted she has notified her neighbors of her proposal and all supported her plans.

I. Door:

The Applicant proposed to replace the existing primary entrance door and accompanying window with two 5' (2 ½ 'each) French doors. There will be no change in the height or width of the opening. The Applicant proposed to use Anderson aluminum clad French doors.

II. Windows:

The Applicant proposed to replace the existing windows on the north façade with 6 over 6 Andersen windows to match the existing windows on the primary structure. The windows on the south façade will be infilled for privacy for the owner and the neighbors to the south.

III. Sky lights:

The Applicant proposed two sky lights that will be mounted as closely to the roof as possible.

IV. Entrance Grade:

The Applicant noted she will replace an existing brick ramp with a wooden stair. The steps will go out about 5' and the landing will be 3' deep across the full width of the front facade. Chairman A. Zgolinski noted that pressure treated wood can be used in the construction but cannot be exposed. A sketch or drawing is needed to show the stoop.

V. Siding:

The applicant also stated that siding will be installed in the back of the building to match the siding on the north and south facades of the structure; currently there is no siding on that façade, only tar paper.

The Board agreed on the following:

- The Board agreed that the siding on sides and front that is to be patched should match existing siding per facade. That is, on the front will be novelty wood siding and on the sides would be wood clapboard.
- The siding on the back of the building will match siding on the north and south sides of the building.
- The Applicant will provide a cut sheet for the sky lights.
- The Applicant will provide a dimensioned drawing of the stoop and stairs.
- Trim and windows on the shed will match the trim and windows on the house.

QUESTION: I THOUGHT WE GAVE HER THE OPTION TO LEAVE THE REAR FAÇADE UNSIDED SINCE THERE CURRENTLY IS NO SIDING

The Chairman called for a vote on the application as modified above. It was approved 5-0. The Applicant is to submit the outstanding supporting materials.

C. Steven Gazzola, 6 Stone St.

The Applicant proposed to replace all but two existing windows, those being the gable-end window on the front façade and a stained glass window on the rear facade. The Applicant noted that all windows will be replaced in kind with 6 over 6 simulated divided lite, wood double-hung windows. The Applicant noted he looked into storm windows but did not prefer the look of them. He also had considered interior storms. Several board members discussed the value in preserving the historic windows, and discussed with the Applicant ideas to preserve them.

Chairman A. Zgolinski asked the applicant to table the application until he has completed researching his options and finalized his plans. The applicant will be placed on future agendas as old business.

D. Joseph Barbaro, 14 Morris Ave.

The Applicant proposed an addition to the kitchen at the rear of the house, which is visible from Craigside Drive. Two shed-roofed additions exist at that location, one on the north and one on the east. They have different roof heights as well as different foundation heights, and joining them via an infill addition creates a number of design challenges, which the applicant and the board debated. After discussion, it was agreed that the roof joint will be resolved as submitted on plans. The clapboard lines will be continued from the north addition, and an existing window will be removed from the north side of the east addition and will not be replaced. The corner board on the north addition will be left in place to break up the length of its extended façade and demarcate the beginning of new construction.

The Chairman called for a vote on the application as modified. It was approved 5-0.

E. Kari Reiber, 8 B Street

The Applicant proposed to construct a one-story porch along the front of her house, similar to other porches found on nearby houses; she specifically cited the porch on #8 Locust Ridge. Currently there is a small masonry landing in front of the house; it will be removed. The proposed porch will be a wooden porch with round columns with simple, Classical bases and capitals, square balusters, a shed roof, and brick supporting piers and with square lattice between the piers. The Applicant noted that all the houses on B street have similar porches. The Board reviewed and discussed the application. It was noted by the Board that the lattice must be vertical and not diagonal lattice as shown in the drawing.

The Board discussed whether or not a public hearing should be held. It was determined that the scope of the project warranted a public hearing, and one was scheduled for Wednesday November 14, 2012 at 8:00 P.M. The Chairman noted that catalog cuts are needed for the balusters, rails and columns, and the Board asked for - updated drawings showing vertical lattice, as well as more details and materials notes. The Chairman reviewed the process of notifying neighbors via registered mail.

F. Peter and Melanie Farrell, 191 Main ST.

The applicant noted they needed a renewal of the Certificate of Appropriateness from 1/18/10. The Applicant noted that the previously approved proposed project had not changed.

The Chairman called for a vote on the Renewal of the Certificate of Appropriateness. It was approved 5-0.

2. Correspondence:

- Eric Wirth – letter regarding Hudson House steps, siding and railings, which he said have been constructed of a plastic material; the chair will refer the matter to the building inspector for review.
- Bill from Putnam County News and Recorder, LLC in the amount of \$21.17 for printing the monthly agenda
- New York Metropolitan Transit Council – Help Plan the Region's Transportation Future open house.
- Forum Journal – Special Conference Issue.
- Common Ground Magazine for distribution.
- Minutes from other boards for review.

3. Board Business:

After the press and public had departed and board members began to review minutes from previous meetings, Mayor Gallagher entered the meeting and asked to discuss the action the board had taken earlier that evening regarding the demolition application from Butterfield Realty LLC. The mayor questioned why the board had called for a public hearing on the application rather than denying the application. He referred to a memo that the HDRB had submitted to the Village Trustees the previous day (Tuesday October 9th) documenting a meeting that took place two days prior (Monday October 10th). Julian Adams, the Certified Local Government coordinator for the New York State Historic Preservation Office, was invited to a joint session with the Village Trustees to discuss the interpretation of the preservation section of the Village Code. In September, the Village attorney and Mayor Gallagher

offered an interpretation of that section that differed from the HDRB's understanding of the code. It as hoped that Mr. Adams would help clarify areas of disagreement. The HDRB memo on that session was submitted as summary to the trustees and was not intended as - minutes; further, no votes were taken by the HDRB related to the content and findings of that meeting. A statement was made in the memo to indicate that the mayor and the village attorney seemed to continue to disagree with Mr. Adams's interpretation, while the HDRB members share d Adams's assessment of the code.

The HDRB memo to the village trustees further stated that in the discussion with Mr. Adams, he said that in the spirit of preservation, the default response to a request for demolition within the historic district is denial, and an applicant then proceeds to the process for a Certificate of Economic Hardship. The board did not understand Mr. Adams to mean that the HDRB should not first conduct fact finding related to the application or hold a public hearing on the application. Board members pointed out to the mayor that the village ordinance, in fact, requires a public hearing when an application is of significant public interest—such is the case with the Butterfield Application.

Mayor Gallagher then argued with the HDRB chair and board regarding the change of a sentence in the report from the original:

"At the end of the meeting with Mr. Adams, the mayor continued to disagree with several of Mr. Adams' interpretations of specific aspects of the code. The HDRB accepted Mr. Adams' findings, however."

to:

"At the end of the meeting with Mr. Adams, the mayor continued to disagree with several of Mr. Adams' interpretations of specific aspects of the code. The HDRB agreed with Mr. Adams' findings, however."

The mayor suggested the original wording wrongly suggested that a vote had been taken by the HDRB related to Mr. Adams's assessment of the ordinance. He had contested this word with Chairman Zgolinski and HDRB/VBOT liaison Matt Francisco. In response, Chairman Zgolinski requested that the word "accepted" be replaced with "agreed with" to satisfy the mayor's concerns. The mayor charged that the word change amounted to tampering with the public record and falsifying public documents. Chairman Zgolinski strongly protested that position, reporting that the wording was changed only after the mayor made known his displeasure with it in its original form, and that it was made openly, without any attempts to conceal the word change from the mayor.

-

Two members; C. Bachan and P. Downey left at about 10:05 P.M. because of the tone and direction of the exchange.

4. Minutes:

Following the visit by the mayor, a reduced board returned to its final agenda item, minutes. The three remaining members, M. Early, K. Foley and A. Zgolinski constituted the quorum which enabled the approval of the minutes.

The minutes of July 11, 2012 were reviewed and approved as amended by a vote of 3-0.

The minutes of September 12, 2012 were reviewed and approved as amended by a vote of 3-0.

K. Foley moved to adjourn the meeting and M. Early seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 11:08 P.M.

Al Zgolinski, Historic District Review Board Chairman

Date